Appeal: 11-1785 Doc: 23 Filed: 03/07/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1785

CAMDEN-CLARK MEMORIAL HOSPITAL CORPORATION,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ST. PAUL FIRE AND MARINE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Parkersburg. Joseph R. Goodwin, Chief District Judge. (6:10-cv-01258)

Submitted: February 28, 2012 Decided: March 7, 2012

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dino S. Colombo, Travis T. Mohler, COLOMBO & STUHR, PLLC, Morgantown, West Virginia, for Appellant. D.C. Offutt, Jr., OFFUTT NORD, Huntington, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Camden-Clark Memorial Hospital Corporation (Camden-Clark) appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company (St. Paul) in Camden-Clark's action for a declaratory judgment of insurance coverage.

We review de novo a district court's order granting summary judgment, viewing the facts and drawing reasonable inferences therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. Bonds v. Leavitt, 629 F.3d 369, 380 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 398 (2011). Summary judgment shall be granted when "there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). A district court should grant summary judgment unless a "reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party" on the evidence presented. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).

We have reviewed the briefs and joint appendix and applicable case law and find no reversible error in the district court's decision. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Camden-Clark Mem. Hosp. Corp. v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co., No. 6:10-cv-01258 (S.D. W. Va. June 28, 2011). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

Appeal: 11-1785 Doc: 23 Filed: 03/07/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED